Brief NOTES ON THE CREED OF St. *ATHANASIUS.*

"WHosoever will be saved, before "all things, 'tis Necessary that He "hold the Catholic Faith.

A Good Life is of Absolute Necessity to Salvation; but *a Right Belief* in these Points that have been always controverted in the Churches of God, is in no degree Necessary, much less *Necessary before all things*. He that leads a Profane or Vicious Life, sins against a plain acknowledg'd Rule, and the express unquestion'd Words and *Letter* of the Divine Law, and the Dictates of Natural Conscience; He *wilfully refuses* to advert to these Monitors, and therefore can no way palliate or excuse his Wickedness. But he that errs in a Question of Faith, after having used *reasonable diligence* to be rightly inform'd, is in no fault at all; *his Error is Pure Ignorance*. Not a culpable Ignorance; for How can it be culpable, not to know that, of which a Man is ignorant, after *a Diligent and Impartial* Inquiry?

"Which Faith except a Man keep Whole "and Undefiled, without doubt He shall pe"rish Everlastingly.

By keeping this Faith *Whole and Undefiled*, must be meant (if any thing be meant) that a Man should believe and profess it, *without Adding to it; or Taking from it.* If we take from it, we do not keep it *Whole*; if we add ought to it, we do not keep it *Undefiled*: and either way we shall perish everlastingly.

First, for *Adding*. What if an Honest plain Man, *because He is a Christian and a Protestant*, should think it Necessary to add this Article to the Athanasian Creed: "I believe "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New "Testaments, to be a Divine, Infallible, and "*Compleat Rule*, both for Faith and Manners? I hope no Protestant would think a Man shall be damned for such Addition: And if so, then this Creed of *Athanasius* is at least *an Unnecessary Rule* of Faith.

Then for *taking ought from* this Creed; the whole Greek Church (diffused through so many Provinces) rejects, *as Heretical*, that Period of it, "The Holy Ghost is of the Fa"ther, and of the Son: contending that the Holy Spirit is *from the Father only*. Which also they clearly and demonstratively prove, as we shall see in its proper place. And for

Brief NOTES ON THE CREED OF St. *ATHANASIUS.*

"WHosoever will be saved, before "all things, 'tis Necessary that He "hold the Catholic Faith.

A Good Life is of Absolute Necessity to Salvation; but *a Right Belief* in these Points that have been always controverted in the Churches of God, is in no degree Necessary, much less *Necessary before all things*. He that leads a Profane or Vicious Life, sins against a plain acknowledg'd Rule, and the express unquestion'd Words and *Letter* of the Divine Law, and the Dictates of Natural Conscience; He *wilfully refuses* to advert to these Monitors, and therefore can no way palliate or excuse his Wickedness. But he that errs in a Question of Faith, after having used *reasonable diligence* to be rightly inform'd, is in no fault at all; *his Error is Pure Ignorance*. Not a culpable Ignorance; for How can it be culpable, not to know that, of which a Man is ignorant, after *a Diligent and Impartial* Inquiry?

"Which Faith except a Man keep Whole "and Undefiled, without doubt He shall pe-"rish Everlastingly.

By keeping this Faith *Whole and Undefiled*, must be meant (if any thing be meant) that a Man should believe and profess it, *without Adding to it; or Taking from it.* If we take from it, we do not keep it *Whole*; if we add ought to it, we do not keep it *Undefiled*: and either way we shall perish everlastingly.

First, for *Adding*. What if an Honest plain Man, *because He is a Christian and a Protestant*, should think it Necessary to add this Article to the Athanasian Creed: "I believe "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New "Testaments, to be a Divine, Infallible, and "*Compleat Rule*, both for Faith and Manners? I hope no Protestant would think a Man shall be damned for such Addition: And if so, then this Creed of *Athanasius* is at least *an Unnecessary Rule* of Faith.

Then for *taking ought from* this Creed; the whole Greek Church (diffused through so many Provinces) rejects, *as Heretical*, that Period of it, "The Holy Ghost is of the Fa-"ther, and of the Son: contending that the Holy Spirit is *from the Father only*. Which also they clearly and demonstratively prove, as we shall see in its proper place. And for

the Menace here of *Athanaſius*, that they ſhall periſh Everlaſtingly; they laugh at it, and ſay, *He was drunk when he made this Creed*, Gennad. Schol. A. Bp. of *Conſtantinopl.*

"And the Catholic Faith is this.

Catholic Faith, is as much as to ſay in plain Engliſh, *the Faith of the whole Church.* Now in what Age was this which here follows, the Faith of the whole Church? Not in the Age of *Athanaſius* himſelf; who for this Faith, and for Seditious Practices, was baniſh'd from *Alexandria* in *Egypt* (where he was Biſhop) no leſs than *Four times*; whereof the firſt was by *Conſtantine* the Great. He was alſo condemned in his own Life-time *by Six Councils*, as an Heretic and Seditious Perſon: Of theſe Councils, that at *Milan* conſiſted of 300 Biſhops; and that at *Ariminum* of 550, the greateſt Convention of Biſhops that ever was. This Conſent of the Churches of God againſt him and his Doctrine, occaſioned that Famous Proverb; Athanaſius *againſt all the World, and all the World againſt* Athanaſius.

For the times Before and After, the curious Reader may ſee *Chr. Sandius* his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: in which the Learned Author gives a large Account, by *what* and *whoſe* means the Athanaſian and Trinitarian Faith did at length prevail, againſt *the Ancient belief* of but One God, or but *One who is God.* Therefore quære, With what Forehead the Author of this Creed, calls this, *the Catholic Faith*, or Faith of the whole Church? when 'tis certain, it has been ſo in no Age, and leaſt of all in the Author's.

"The Catholic Faith is this, That we "worſhip one God in Trinity; and Trinity "in Unity.

He means here, that we muſt ſo worſhip the one true God, as to remember He is Three Perſons; and ſo worſhip the Three Perſons, as to bear in mind that they are but one Subſtance, or Godhead, or God. So the Author explains himſelf in the three next Articles, which are theſe;

"Neither confounding the Perſons, nor "dividing the Subſtance: for there is one "Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, "another of the Holy Ghoſt: but the God-"head of the Father, and of the Son, and of "the Holy Ghoſt, is all one. Therefore all theſe Articles make indeed but one Article, which is this; "The one true God is *Three* "*diſtinct Perſons*; and Three diſtinct Perſons "(Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) are the "one true God.

Plainly, as if a Man ſhould ſay, *Peter, James*, and *John*, being *Three Perſons*, are *one Man*; and one Man is theſe Three diſtinct Perſons, *Peter, James*, and *John.* Is it not now a Ridiculous Attempt, as well as a Barbarous Indignity, to go about thus to make Aſſes of all Mankind, under pretence of teaching them a Creed, and things Divine, to deſpoil them of their Reaſon, the Image of God, and the Character of our Nature? But let us, in two words, examine the parts of this Monſtrous Propoſition, as 'tis laid down in the Creed it ſelf.

"Neither confounding the Perſons, nor "dividing the Subſtance.

But how can we not confound the Perſons, that have (they ſay) but *one numerical Subſtance?* And how can we but divide the Subſtance, which we find in three *diſtinct divided* Perſons?

"There is one Perſon of the Father, ano-"ther of the Son, another of the H. Ghoſt.

Then the Son is not the Father, nor is the Father the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt either of them: I ſhall not need to prove this Conſequence, not only becauſe 'tis evident, but becauſe 'tis acknowledged by the Trinitarians. But if the Father is not the Son, and yet is (by confeſſion of All) *the One true God*; then the Son is not the One true God, becauſe He is not the Father: the reaſon is ſelf-evident, for How can the Son be the one true God, *if he is not He who is the One true God?* After the ſame manner it may be proved, that (on the Athanaſian Principles) neither the Father nor Holy Spirit are, or can be God, or the One true God; for neither of them is the Son, who is the One true God

God according to *Athanaſius*, and all Trinitarians: for they all ſay, the Father is the One true God, the Son is the One true God, and the Holy Ghoſt is the One true God. Which is a three-fold Contradiction, becauſe there is but One true God, and One of theſe Perſons is not the other. But if it be a Contradiction, 'tis certainly falſe; for every Contradiction being made up of Inconſiſtences, deſtroys it ſelf, and *is its own Confutation.*

" The Godhead of the Father, and of " the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, is all " One; the Glory equal, the Majeſty coe- " ternal.

The meaning of the laſt Clauſe is, That the Glory and Majeſty of the Son and Holy Spirit, is equal to the Glory and Majeſty of the Father; or the Son and Holy Spirit are equally Glorious and Majeſtical with God the Father.

Therefore I ask, Whether the Glory and Majeſty, with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majeſtical, be *the ſame in Number* (that is, the very ſame) with which the Father is Glorious and Majeſtical; or only *the ſame for Kind and Degree?* If it be not the ſame *in Number*, then the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not (as this Creed teaches) *all One*; and they are not one and the ſame God: for two *Infinite and Diſtinct Glories*, and *Majeſties*, make two Gods, and three make three Gods; as every one ſees, and (to ſay true) the Trinitarians themſelves confeſs. It remains therefore that, they ſay, the Glory and Majeſty of the Son and Spirit, is *the ſame in Number*, and not for Kind and Degree only, with that of the Father: but then it follows, that the Glory and Majeſty of theſe Perſons is *neither Equal nor Coeternal.* Not Equal; for 'tis the ſame, which Equals never are: nor Coeternal, for this alſo plainly intimates that they are Diſtinct; for how Coeternal, if not Diſtinct? Do we ſay, a thing is Coeternal or Contemporary with it ſelf? Therefore this Article alſo doth impugn and deſtroy it ſelf. Beſides, if the Glory and Majeſty of the Three Perſons be *numerically the ſame*, then ſo are all their other Attributes: from whence it follows, that there is not any real Difference between the Three Perſons; and they are only *three ſeveral Names of God*; which is the Hereſy of the Sabellians.

In the next place this Creed teaches, that "The Father is Incomprehenſible, Un- "create, Eternal, Almighty; the Son is "Incomprehenſible, Uncreate, Eternal, Al- "mighty; the Holy Spirit is Incomprehenſi- "ble, Uncreate, Eternal, Almighty: Alſo "that each of theſe Perſons *by himſelf* is God "and Lord; ſo that the Father is God, the "Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God: "yet there are not Three Gods or Lords, "nor Three Incomprehenſibles, nor Three "All-mighties, nor Three Eternals or Un- "created.

Now if in imitation of this, a Man ſhould have a mind to ſay; "The Father is a Per- "ſon, the Son is a Perſon, and the Holy "Ghoſt is a Perſon; yet *not Three Perſons*, "but one Perſon. I would know, why this were not as good *Grammar and Arithmetick*; as when *Athanaſius* ſays, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God, yet *not three Gods*, but one God: or when He ſays, the Father Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, and the Holy Ghoſt Uncreated, yet *not three Uncreated* but one Uncreated; and ſo of the reſt?

Doth not a Man contradict himſelf, when the Term or Terms in his Negation, are the ſame with thoſe in his Affirmation? If not, then it may be true, that "the Father "is a Perſon, the Son is a Perſon, the Holy "Ghoſt is a Perſon, yet *there are not Three* "*Perſons*, but One Perſon: For all the Fault here is only this, that in the laſt Clauſe the term *Perſon* is *denied* to belong to more than One, when in the firſt it had been *affirmed* of no fewer than Three. For the ſame Reaſon it muſt be a Contradiction to ſay, "The "Father is God, the Son is God, and the "H. Ghoſt is God, yet *there not are three Gods*, "but one God: For the Term *God* is at laſt

denied to belong to more than One, though in the first Clause it was *affirmed* of Three. Will they say that in these words, *there are not Three Gods, but one God*; the Term *God* is not Denied to belong to more than One, or is not appropriated to One? If so, then *there are not three Persons, but one Person*; *and* again, *There are not three Men, but one Man*: Then, I say, these Propositions do not Deny the Terms *Person* and *Man* to belong to more than One, or appropriate them to One only; which yet every Body confesses they do.

But here is a *Numerical*, or Arithmetical, as well as Grammatical Contradiction. For in saying, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; yet not Three Gods, but One God: A Man first distinctly numbers Three Gods; and then in summing them up, *brutishly* says, not Three Gods, but One God.

To these things it will perhaps be answered, that when we say, *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost*; or thus, *The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God*; the Term *God* is used Personally: but when 'tis said, *There are not Three Gods, but one God*; the term *God* is used Essentially, and therefore comprehends the whole Three Persons; so that there is neither a *Grammatical, nor Arithmetical Contradiction.* But this Remedy is worse (if possible) than the Disease: for it owns that there are *Three Personal Gods*, though there is but *one Essential God*; and that otherways the Propositions of which we are speaking, would imply all the aforesaid Contradictions. This Remedy, I say, is worse than the Disease; for, 1. Three Personal Gods, and one Essential God, make Four Gods, if the Essential God be not the same with the Personal Gods: and though He is the same with them, yet since they are not the same with one another, but distinct, it follows that there are Three Gods, that is, Three Personal Gods. 2. It introduces *two sorts of True Gods*, Three Personal, and one Essential. But the Christian Religion knows and owns but one True and most High God, of any sort. And I would know of the Trinitarians, whether they dare say, in expres words, *There are two sorts of True Gods?*

" For like as we are *compelled* by the " Christian Verity, to acknowledg every " Person *by himself* to be Lord and God, *&c.*

By the Christian Verity I suppose is meant, the Sacred Books which contain the Christian Religion; that is, the Books of the Old and New Testaments. But do these Books, and do's this *Verity* compel us to the acknowledgment of three Persons, each of which is *by Himself* Supream God and Lord, and yet all of them together but one God? Doth, I say, the Holy Scripture *compel us* to this contradictory Acknowledgment? Is there any Text alledged from Scripture, which all the Unitarians, and some or other of the most Learned Trinitarians, do not easily interpret in such sense, that the Unity of God is preserved; and no more than one Person (even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ) acknowledged to be God? see the History of the *Unitarians*. But if there is no Text of Scripture, but what is in the Opinion of some or other of their own Learned Men, fairly capable of a sense contrary to the Faith deliver'd in this Creed; then we are *not compelled* to acknowledg this Faith. And the truth is, the Contest between the Unitarians and Trinitarians is not, as is commonly thought, *a Clash of Reason with Scripture*: but it layeth here, Whether, when the Holy Scriptures may be understood as teaching only one God, or but One who is God, which agrees with the rest of Scripture, and with Natural Reason; we must notwithstanding, prefer an Interpretation of it that is Absurd, and contrary to it self, to Reason, and to the rest of Scripture, such as the Trinitarian Interpretation (expres in this Creed) appears to be? In a word, the Question only is, Whether we ought to interpret Holy Scripture when it speaks of God, *according to Reason*, or not; that is, like Fools, or like Wise Men?

" The

"The Son is of the Father alone; not "Made, nor Created, but Begotten.

Here, and in the next period, *Athanaſius* is got into his Altitudes, or Profundities, which you will. Here 'tis that the Ignorant think, they are taught the Inmoſt Secrets of Theological Knowledg: but *High* and *Low* are not more contrary, than the things which are here affirmed as equal Truths.

If the Creed-maker had ſpoke here of the Generation of the Son by the Divine Power on the Virgin *Mary*, it would have been true that, *the Son is neither Made, nor Created, but Begotten:* but then the firſt part of the Article would be falſe, that *the Son is of the Father alone*; for He that has a Father, and a Mother, is *of Both*. But ſince he ſpeaks of the (pretended) Eternal Generation, the latter part of the Article is Falſe, and inconſiſtent with the firſt part of it. Every Novice in Grammar, and proper ſpeaking, knows, that *Begotten*, when 'tis diſtinguiſhed from *Made* and *Created*, always ſuppoſes two Parents, a Mother as well as a Father: 'tis therefore a Contradiction to ſay, *the Son is of the Father alone, not Made, nor Created, but Begotten*; for if He is Begotten, He cannot be of the Father alone; and if He is of the Father alone, He is not begotten, but *either Made, or Created*.

"The Holy Ghoſt is of the Father and "of the Son; neither Made, nor Created, "nor Begotten, but Proceeding.

The firſt Fault here is, that the Holy Spirit is ſaid to proceed from the Father *and from the Son*. To which Hereſy the Greek Church have ever oppoſed thoſe clear words, John 15. 26. *When the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you* from the Father; *even the Spirit of Truth* which Proceedeth from the Father, *He ſhall teſtify of me.*

Secondly, He ſaith here, that the Holy Ghoſt is *not Begotten, but Proceeding:* He adds ſhortly after, that *He who will be ſaved, muſt thus think of the Trinity:* Therefore ſurely *Begotten* and *Proceeding* differ very much, and very clearly; elſe 'tis an Harſh Sentence, that we ſhall be damned if we do not Conceive, beſides all other unconceivable Myſteries of this Creed, that the Holy Ghoſt is *not Begotten*, but *Proceeds*. Yet after all, 'tis now confeſſed by the moſt Learned Trinitarians, that Begotten and Proceeding differ nothing at all: and that it is rightly ſaid, *The Son proceeds from the Father*, and that *the Holy Ghoſt is generated of Both*; directly contrary to this Creed. It follows that *Athanaſius* has damned the whole World, for not diſtinguiſhing where no Diſtinction can be made, at leaſt with any certainty. And perhaps this Damning Humour of his, has *juſtly* provoked ſome to write him, not *S. Athanaſius*, but (drawing the *S* a little nearer) *Sathanaſius*.

"So there is one Father, not Three Fa-"thers; one Son, not three Sons; one "Holy Ghoſt, not three Holy Ghoſts.

In conſiſtence with what goes before, He ſhould have ſaid, Two Fathers; Two Sons; and Three Holy Ghoſts, or Spirits. For the Second Perſon is the Son of the Firſt, and the Third proceeds (which is nothing elſe but *is Generated*) from the Firſt and Second, which makes Two Fathers and Two Sons: and all Three of them are Holy Spirits; for the Father is an Holy Spirit, and ſo is the Son, no leſs than the Third Perſon. But this is not the firſt time in this Creed, that *Athanaſius* has diſcovered *He could not count*.

"In this Trinity, none is Afore or After "other; none is Greater, or Leſs than ano-"ther.

Yet the Son himſelf ſaith, *John* 14 28. *My Father is Greater than I.* And for the other clauſe, *None is Afore or After other*; 'tis juſt as true as that there is no difference at all between Afore and After. I ask, Whether the Son doth not, *as He is a Son*, derive both Life and Godhead from the Father? All Trinitarians grant, He do's; grounding themſelves on the *Nicene* Creed, which expreſly calls the Son, *God of God, Light of*

Light,

Light, very God of very God; Begotten, not Made. But if the Father gave to the Son Life and Godhead; He muſt have both before he could communicate or give either of them to the Son, and conſequently was afore the Son was. No Effect is ſo early as its Cauſe; for if it were, it ſhould not have needed, or had that for its Cauſe. No Propoſition in *Euclid* is more certain or evident than this.

" The right Faith is, That we believe " and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, " the Son of God, is both God and Man.

Then the Lord Chriſt is *two Perſons.* For as He is God, He is the ſecond Perſon of the (pretended) Trinity: and as He is Man (*a perfect Man*, as this Creed afterwards ſpeaks) He is alſo a Perſon; for a Rational Soul, vitally united to an Human Body, is a Perſon, if there be any ſuch thing as Perſon upon Earth; nay, 'tis the only thing upon Earth that is a Perſon. Let the *Athanaſians* therefore either ſay, that the Lord Chriſt is *Two Perſons*; which is the Hereſy of *Neſtorius*, condemned in a General Council: Or, that He is *not a Man*, contrary to 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jeſus Chriſt:* Or, that He is *not God*, which is the Truth.

" Who, altho He be God and Man; yet " He is not two, but one Chriſt. One, " not by converſion of the Godhead into " Fleſh, but by taking of the Manhood " into God: One, not by Confuſion of Sub- " ſtance, but by Unity of Perſon.

But becauſe theſe words, *One by taking of the Manhood into God, not by converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh:* And again, *One, not by Confuſion of Subſtance, but Unity of Perſon*; cannot readily be underſtood by themſelves: the Creed-Maker explains them in this following Article; *For as the Reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man; ſo God and Man is one Chriſt:* That is, as a Soul united vitally to a Body, maketh one Perſon, called Man, without confounding the two Subſtances of the Soul and Body; for the Soul remains what it was, and ſo alſo does the Body: So God the Son being united to a Reaſonable Soul and Body, doth, *together with them*, make one Perſon, called Chriſt, without confounding the Subſtances of the Divinity or Humanity; for the Divinity remains, without the leaſt Change, what it was, and ſo doth the Humanity, or Reaſonable Soul and Body. This is the only Offer at Senſe that is to be found in this whole Creed; but ſo far from explicating, that it farther perplexes the Difficulty of the (pretended) Incarnation; as will appear by theſe two Conſiderations.

1. In the *Perſonal Union* of a Soul with a Body, the Union is between two Finite things: but in *the* (pretended) *Perſonal Union* of God to Man and Man to God, the Union is between Finite and Infinite; which (on the Principles of the Trinitarians) is impoſſible. For we muſt either ſuppoſe, that Finite and Infinite are Commenſurate, that is Equal; which every one knows is falſe: or that the Finite is united but to ſome part of the Infinite, and *is disjoyned from the reſt*; which all Trinitarians deny and abhor.

You will ſay, If they admit neither of theſe, how do they ſhew the Poſſibility of the Incarnation, or Union of God to Man? They tell you, God indeed is Infinite, and every Reaſonable Soul and Body (even that of Chriſt) is Finite; yet the whole God and whole Man are united; becauſe, *As the whole Eternity of God doth coexiſt to a moment of Time; ſo the whole Immenſity of God is in every Mathematical Point of Space.* The very Truth is, they cannot otherways defend the Incarnation, or *Perſonal Union* of an Infinite God to a Finite Man: but withal it muſt be owned, that then the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation do infer, imply, and ſuppoſe all the Contradictions that Mr. *Johnſon* has objected to the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, in that little Golden Tract, ſo deſervedly eſteemed by All. His whole Book, and all his Demonſtrations are founded on theſe two *Suppoſitions*,

positions, that *a longer time doth not all of it coexist to a shorter*; nor is *a greater Extension constipated or contained in a less*, much less in a Mathematical Point. Therefore all his Book, and all that he hath so well said and argued in the Preface concerning the Authority and Judicature of Reason in Matters of Religion, equally and effectually destroys the Doctrines of the Trinity and Transubstantiation. If the Reader would have an excellent Book, let him procure that. But Oh! were the Press as free for the Unitarians as 'tis for other Protestants; how easily would they make it appear, that the Follies and Contradictions so justly charged on the Transubstantiation, are neither for Number, Consequence, nor Clearness any way comparable, to those implied in the *Athanasian* Creed; and that the Trinity hath the same (and no other) Foundation with the Transubstantiation, so that we must of necessity admit both or neither? If *the Church* is to interpret Scripture for us, we must admit both; but if *Reason*, we can admit neither, and this (I think) the Trinitarians will not deny.

But secondly, In the (pretended) Incarnation or Union of God with Man, the Union cannot be Personal, as 'tis between the Soul and Body; it cannot, I mean, be such an Union as to make but one Person. The Union of the Soul and Body may be properly Personal, that is, may constitute or make one Person; because 'tis not the Union of two Persons, but only of one Person (the Soul) to a thing otherways without Life, Reason, Memory, or Free-will. The Body is but as it were the Garment of the Soul, and is wholly acted by it, and depending on it. But in the (pretended) Union of God with a Man, there are two distinct and very different Lives, Memories, Reasons, and Free-Wills: which utterly destroys a Personal Union, for that supposes but one Life, one Reason, one Memory, one Free-Will: for if these things which constitute a Person, are found more than once, there is no longer one Person but two, and consequently no Personal Union in the sense of which we are speaking.

" This is the Catholic Faith; which ex-
" cept a Man believe faithfully, He cannot
" be saved.

By Believing, *Athanasius* doth not mean bare believing, but He includeth also therein *Profession:* for, He saith, a little before, *The right Faith is, that we Believe and Confess*, &c. So that a Man cannot be saved, unless He Believes and Professes as this Creed directs him.

First, For *Believing*. *What if a Man cannot believe it?* Are we obliged, under the Penalty of the loss of Salvation, to believe it, whether we can or no? Doth God require of any Man *an Impossible Condition*, in order to Salvation?

Secondly, As to professing under pain of Damnation. *What if it be against a Man's Conscience to profess it?* The Scripture saith, *Whatsoever is not of Faith, is Sin*; if therefore a Man profess against his Conscience, He sins; and if notwithstanding this, a Man must either Profess, or be Damned, then God requires *some Men* to sin in order to their Salvation: but this we are sure is False, and therefore that the Menace in the Article is vain.

And now I appeal to all Men, that have any freedom of Judgment remaining; Whether this Creed is fit to be retained in any Christian, much less Protestant and Reformed Church? Since it subverts the Foundations, not only of Christianity, but of all Religion, that is to say, Reason and Revelation: there being no Principle in Reason and Scripture more evident, than that *God is One*; or that there is one Almighty, only-Wise and Good Person, or Father of all. If we cannot be sure of this, then Religion and Christianity are built upon Fancy only, and have no solid Foundation.

This Creed may be profess'd by the Roman Political Church; because it gives coun-

countenance to their Absurd Transubstantiation, and Cunning Traditions added to Scripture; as those Doctrines do to the gaining of Veneration, and consequently Dominion and Riches to their Clergy: But in a Reformed Church, where the Scripture is held to be *a Compleat Rule* of Faith and Manners, and also to be *Clear and Plain* in all things necessary to Salvation, even to the meanest Understanding, that reads it or hears it with Sobriety and Attention; such a Confession of Faith is (I think) intolerable, as being utterly inconsistent with those Principles, and reducing us back to the Roman Bondage.

Besides, Nothing has been or is more scandalous to Jews and Mahometans, than this Creed, the chief Article of whose Religion is, that there is *one only God*. The Evidence of which Principle is such in Nature as well as Scripture, that it has propagated Mahomatism among greater Numbers, than at this day own Christianity; for the sake of that one Truth, so many Nations have swallowed all the Errors and Follies of the *Alcoran*, or Book of *Mahomet*; as on the other Hand, Christianity has been rejected and detested among them, on the account of the Christians *Three Persons, who are severally and each of them God*.

But the Mischiefs of this Creed do not stay here, it is levelled not only against the True Faith, but is also destructive of that Love and Charity, which is the Spirit and Life of Christianity; and without which, Faith is but a Life-less Body. For as if it would effectually inspire all its Believers, with a Spirit of Judging, Damning, and Uncharitableness; it pronounces the Sentence of Eternal Damnation, in the Beginning, Middle and Conclusion, upon all that do not both Believe and Profess this Faith, and keep it whole and undefiled; that is, upon the whole Greek Church, and other Churches in the East; and upon at least Five Parts of Six of all that profess Christianity in the World, whose Understandings cannot possibly reach to the Sense and Coherence, which some pretend to find in this Creed.

Thus the Christian Religion is destroyed, in both the Essential Parts of it, Faith and Love. Hence have proceeded many and endless Controversies, bitter Animosities, cruel Persecutions, Wars among Christians: and at length the more Fierce and Violent, the more Deceitful and Sophistical Part, have attained their Tyrannical Domination over their Opposers; and have introduced and settled, a Christianity shall I call it, or, *a Superstition*, or *a Polity*, quite contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of our Blessed Lord, and of his Apostles?

FINIS.